arXiv:1612.01207v1 [math.AG] 4 Dec 2016

PERVERSE SHEAVES AND THE REDUCTIVE BOREL-SERRE COMPACTIFICATION

LESLIE SAPER

Dedicated to Steve Zucker, with great respect and admiration

1. Introduction

This paper is a report on work in progress to better understand the category of perverse sheaves on the Baily-Borel compactification X^* of a locally symmetric variety by using perverse sheaves on the reductive Borel-Serre compactification $\widehat{X}$.

1.1. **Definition.** Perverse sheaves were introduced in [5] by Beilinson, Bernstein, and Deligne following Goresky and MacPherson's introduction of intersection homology [19]. (For a full account of the exciting discoveries and interactions around that time, see Kleiman's excellent history [26]). We begin by briefly recalling the definition (and to avoid confusion, we point out, as in [5], that a perverse sheaf is not actually a sheaf nor is it perverse).

Let Y be a stratified pseudomanifold and fix an integer-valued function on the set of strata of Y called the *perversity*;[1] if all the strata of Y have even dimension, it is most useful to take for p the *middle perversity*, $p(S) = -(1/2)\dim S$. Let $\mathbf{D}^b_c(Y)$ be the constructible bounded derived category of Y; objects may be represented by complexes of sheaves on Y (up to quasi-isomorphism) whose cohomology lives in a bounded range of degrees and is locally constant along each stratum. By definition, a perverse sheaf $\mathcal{P}$ on Y (constructible with respect to the given stratification) is an object $\mathcal{S}$ whose local cohomology $H(i_S^*\mathcal{S})$ along each stratum $i_S\colon S \hookrightarrow Y$ lives in degrees $\leq p(S)$ and whose local cohomology supported on S, $H(i_S^!\mathcal{S})$, lives in degrees $\geq p(S)$. The perverse sheaves on Y form an abelian category $\mathbf{P}(Y)$ which is Artinian and Noetherian. For every connected stratum S and irreducible local system $\mathbf{E}$ on S there is a simple perverse sheaf $\mathcal{P}_S(\mathbf{E}) = \mathcal{P}_{p,S}(\mathbf{E})$ and all simple objects are obtained in this fashion. In fact $\mathcal{P}_S(\mathbf{E})$ is the intersection cohomology sheaf of $\overline{S}$ with coefficients in $\mathbf{E}$ shifted by $-p(S)$.

When Y is a complex algebraic variety, we will always consider the middle perversity. In addition, one usually does not fix the (algebraic) stratification in the definitions of $\mathbf{D}^b_c(Y)$ and $\mathbf{P}(Y)$.

1.2. **Two original applications.** Perverse sheaves have played a critical role in the topology of algebraic varieties and representation theory from their beginning; we mention just two examples from the early days. For a fuller survey of applications, see [14].

The first example is the Kazdhan-Lusztig conjecture. Let $Y = G/B$ be the flag variety associated to a simply connected semisimple complex algebraic group G. It is stratified by

Date: December 6, 2016.

[1]The origin of the term "perversity" goes back to the creation of intersection homology by Goresky and MacPherson [19] where chains were constrained so that the dimension of their intersection with a singular stratum S was at most $p(S) - p(S_0) - 1$ more than that allowed by transversality (S_0 being the open dense stratum).

its B-orbits S_w which are indexed by w in the Weyl group W of G; each closure $\overline{S_w}$ is a Schubert variety. The correspondence $w \leftrightarrow S_w$ is order preserving in the sense that $y \leq w$ if and only if $S_y \subset \overline{S_w}$. For $y \leq w \in W$, Kazdhan and Lusztig [24] gave a conjectural formula for the multiplicity of the irreducible $\mathfrak{g}$-module L_y with highest weight $y\rho - \rho$ in the composition series of the Verma module M_w with highest weight $w\rho - \rho$. The formula involved a combinatorially defined polynomial $P_{y,w}(q)$ which appeared to be related to the failure of Poincaré duality on $\overline{S_w}$; later they showed [25] that the coefficients in $P_{y,w}(q)$ were $\dim H^k(i_{S_y}^* \mathcal{P}_{S_w}(\mathbf{C}))$, the local Betti numbers along S_y of the simple perverse sheaf associated to S_w.

The conjecture was resolved independently by Beilinson and Bernstein [6] and by Brylinski and Kashiwara [11] by transferring the problem from representations to perverse sheaves. Specifically one shows that a certain category of $\mathfrak{g}$-modules (including all L_y and M_w) is equivalent to the category of regular holonomic $\mathscr{D}_Y$-modules and that by the Riemann-Hilbert correspondence this category is equivalent to $\mathbf{P}(Y)$.

The second original example of the importance of perverse sheaves is the decomposition theorem. This deep result about the topology of proper algebraic maps was first proved by Beilinson, Bernstein, Deligne, and Gabber [5, *Théorème* 6.2.5] and later extended by Saito [38, 39]. It says that if $X \to Y$ is a proper morphism of algebraic varieties, then the direct image of a simple perverse sheaf of Hodge type on X decomposes into the direct sum of shifted simple perverse sheaves, likewise of Hodge type, supported on subvarieties of Y. Here by a simple perverse sheaf of Hodge type we mean one that corresponds to a polarizable Hodge module in the sense of Saito; by [38, *Lemmes* 5.1.10, 5.2.12; 39, Theorem 0.2], such simple perverse sheaves are precisely those of the form $\mathcal{P}_S(\mathbf{E})$ where $\mathbf{E}$ underlies a real polarizable variation of Hodge structure. As a special case, if $\widetilde{Y} \to Y$ is a resolution of singularities, the theorem implies that the ordinary cohomology $H^\cdot(\widetilde{Y}; \mathbf{C})$ is the direct sum of shifted middle perversity intersection cohomology groups of subvarieties of Y with various local systems as coefficients. Furthermore one summand will be $IH^\cdot(Y; \mathbf{C})$, the intersection cohomology of Y itself.

The proof in [5] is for a simple perverse sheaf of geometric origin and proceeds by first dealing with the theorem over the algebraic closure of a finite field and then lifting the result to $\mathbf{C}$. The version of the theorem stated above was proved by Saito [38, 39] using purely characteristic 0 methods. It uses mixed Hodge modules, which are regular holonomic $\mathscr{D}$-modules equipped with various filtrations and satisfying certain conditions; they correspond to the mixed perverse sheaves over finite fields considered in [5]. A pure Hodge module corresponds under the Riemann-Hilbert correspondence to a simple perverse sheaf of Hodge type.

More recently, other proofs and generalizations of the decomposition theorem have been given. A proof of the constant coefficient case using classical Hodge theory was given by de Cataldo and Migliorini [13]; for more details and a discussion of the different approaches to the decomposition theorem see also their survey [14]. Kashiwara has conjectured [23] that the decomposition theorem should hold for *any* simple perverse sheaf. This conjecture has been proven analytically using polarizable pure twistor $\mathscr{D}$-modules by work of Sabbah [37] and Mochizuki [32, 33]. At about the same time, an arithmetic proof was given independently by Böckle and Khare [7] and by Gaitsgory [17]; they proved de Jong's conjecture [15] which by Drinfeld [16] implies Kashiwara's conjecture. Note that Kashiwara actually conjectures the theorem should hold for a simple holonomic $\mathscr{D}_X$-module with possibly irregular singularities; this has been settled by Mochizuki [34].

1.3. **Locally symmetric varieties.** Our main interest here is the category of perverse sheaves on a locally symmetric variety. Let $X = \Gamma\backslash D = \Gamma\backslash G(\mathbf{R})/A_G(\mathbf{R})K$ be an arithmetic quotient of a symmetric space of noncompact type; here G is a reductive algebraic group defined over $\mathbf{Q}$, K a maximal compact subgroup of $G(\mathbf{R})$, A_G is the maximal $\mathbf{Q}$-split torus in the center of G, and Γ is an arithmetic subgroup. Our main focus will be when D is Hermitian symmetric and unless otherwise noted we shall assume that in this introduction, however some non-Hermitian symmetric spaces will arise as well.

A natural choice of compactification in the Hermitian case is the Baily-Borel compactification X^* [3] (topologically it is one of Satake's compactifications). The Baily-Borel compactification is a projective algebraic variety defined over a number field; it is commonly called a locally symmetric variety. Locally symmetric varieties and Shimura varieties, their adelic variants, play an important role in number theory, automorphic forms, and the Langlands's program.

The Baily-Borel compactification X^* has a natural stratification $\coprod_Q F_Q$, where Q ranges over all Γ-conjugacy classes of saturated parabolic $\mathbf{Q}$-subgroups of G; when G is almost $\mathbf{Q}$-simple the saturated condition simply means Q is maximal parabolic $\mathbf{Q}$-subgroup. Each F_Q is again a Hermitian locally symmetric space associated to a reductive group $L_{Q,h}$, a quotient of Q; its closure $\overline{F_Q}$ in X^* is a subvariety and is the Baily-Borel compactification F_Q^* of F_Q. We fix this stratification when considering perverse sheaves on X^*.

On the locally symmetric space X one usually considers local systems $\mathbf{E}$ that arise from a representation E of G as opposed to merely a representation of Γ. We say that the simple perverse sheaf $\mathcal{P}_X(\mathbf{E})$ on X^* is *reductively constructible* if the coefficient system $\mathbf{E}$ arises from a representation E of G as above; similarly $\mathcal{P}_{F_Q}(\mathbf{E})$ is reductively constructible if $\mathbf{E}$ arises from a representation of $L_{Q,h}$.

Zucker's conjecture [45] gives an analytic realization of a simple reductively constructible perverse sheaf $\mathcal{P}_X(\mathbf{E})$. The choice of an admissible inner product [31] on E induces a metric on $\mathbf{E}$ which we assume fixed. The conjecture then states that there is a natural isomorphism $\mathcal{P}_X(\mathbf{E}) \cong \mathcal{L}_2(X^*;\mathbf{E})[-p(X)]$, where $\mathcal{L}_2(X^*;\mathbf{E})$ is the sheafification of the presheaf that associates to $U \subset X^*$ the complex of $\mathbf{E}$-valued differential forms on $U \cap X$ which, together with their exterior derivative, are L^2 with respect to the natural locally symmetric metric on X and the above metric on $\mathbf{E}$. The conjecture was independently settled at about the same time by Looijenga [29] and Saper and Stern [43] using quite different methods.

The conjecture thus shows that the reductively constructible simple perverse sheaves $\mathcal{P}_{F_Q}(\mathbf{E})$ are related to representations $L^2(\Gamma_{L_{Q,h}}\backslash L_{Q,h}(\mathbf{R}))$ (see [10]) and hence to automorphic forms. The full category of (not necessarily simple) perverse sheaves on X^* is thus clearly worth further study.

1.4. **The reductive Borel-Serre compactification.** In general X^* is very singular so it may be profitable to study its perverse sheaves by using a resolution.

A natural choice for an algebraic resolution, though non-unique, is one of the smooth toroidal compactifications $\tilde{\pi}\colon \widetilde{X}_\Sigma \to X^*$ [1]. Let $\mathcal{P}_X(\mathbf{E})$ be a reductively constructible simple perverse sheaf on X^*. Let $U = \tilde{\pi}^{-1}(X) \subset \widetilde{X}_\Sigma$; via $\tilde{\pi}$ we can view $\mathbf{E}$ also as a local system on

U. The decomposition theorem applies[2] to show that $\tilde{\pi}_*\mathcal{P}_U(\mathbf{E})$ is the direct sum of (shifted) simple perverse sheaves on X^*, one of which is $\mathcal{P}_X(\mathbf{E})$.

However this argument does not easily extend to treat simple perverse sheaves supported on smaller closed strata of X^*. For example $\tilde{\pi}^{-1}(F_Q)$ is rarely smooth nor irreducible.

To get around this we look instead at the reductive Borel-Serre compactification $\widehat{X}$. This was introduced by Zucker in the same paper [45] where he made his conjecture about the L^2-cohomology of X. (It is actually defined for any arithmetic locally symmetric space, not necessarily Hermitian.) It is non-algebraic (in fact it may have odd dimensional strata) but it is canonically associated to X and its singularities are easy to describe. Zucker [46] showed that there is a continuous quotient map $\pi\colon \widehat{X} \to X^*$ extending the identity on X so that $\widehat{X}$ may be viewed as a partial resolution of singularities. Goresky and Tai [22] show that up to homotopy any $\tilde{\pi}$ factors through $\widehat{X}$. So in this sense it is a minimal partial resolution.

The reductive Borel-Serre compactification $\widehat{X}$ has a natural stratification $\coprod_P X_P$, where P ranges over all Γ-conjugacy classes of parabolic $\mathbf{Q}$-subgroups of G. Each X_P is again an arithmetic locally symmetric space associated to a reductive group, namely L_P, the Levi quotient of P; its closure $\overline{X_P}$ in $\widehat{X}$ is the reductive Borel-Serre compactification $\widehat{X}_P$ of X_P. We fix this stratification when considering perverse sheaves on $\widehat{X}$. Since $\widehat{X}$ may have odd dimensional strata, there are two middle perversities, p_- and p_+ (see (3.1)), that we will consider, both depending only on the dimension of the stratum. A simple perverse sheaf $\mathcal{P}_{X_P}(\mathbf{E})$ on $\widehat{X}$ is *reductively constructible* if $\mathbf{E}$ is induced from a representation E of L_P.

Despite $\widehat{X}$ not being algebraic, it "wants" to be algebraic. For example, Zucker showed [48] that its cohomology carries a mixed Hodge structure such that

$$H^\cdot(X^*) \xrightarrow{\pi^*} H^\cdot(\widehat{X}) \xrightarrow{i_X^*} H^\cdot(X)$$

are morphisms of mixed Hodge structures. (Here the outer two cohomology groups carry Deligne's canonical mixed Hodge structure.) Furthermore, Ayoub and Zucker [2] construct a motive corresponding to $\widehat{X}$.

As another example of the algebraic-like nature of $\widehat{X}$ is the conjecture of Rapoport [36] and of Goresky and MacPherson [21]. This conjecture was proved by Saper and Stern [36, Appendix] when the $\mathbf{Q}$-rank of G is 1, and by Saper [40] in general. It states that for a local system $\mathbf{E}$ associated to a representation of G,

$$\pi_*\mathcal{P}_{X_G}(\mathbf{E}) = \mathcal{P}_{F_G}(\mathbf{E})\ ; \tag{1.1}$$

Here the perversity on the left (for $\widehat{X}$) can be either of the two middle perversities—one obtains the same pushforward.

Unlike in the situation for $\tilde{\pi}\colon \widetilde{X}_\Sigma \to X^*$, the methods of [40] can be used to generalize (1.1) to all reductively constructible simple perverse sheaves $\mathcal{P}_{X_P}(\mathbf{E})$ on $\widehat{X}$. Specifically (see [40, §21]) for every parabolic $\mathbf{Q}$-subgroup P, there is a saturated parabolic $\mathbf{Q}$-subgroup $P^\dagger$ so that $\pi(X_P) = F_{P^\dagger}$. In fact, $\pi|_{X_P}\colon X_P \to F_{P^\dagger}$ is a flat bundle which becomes trivial over a finite cover of $F_{P^\dagger}$; the fiber is $X_{P,\ell}$, a locally symmetric space *not* usually of Hermitian

[2]We only need the version proved by Saito here by the following argument. In the Hermitian case, Zucker [47] has shown $\mathbf{E}$ underlies a complex polarizable variation of Hodge structure; it only a real polarizable variation of Hodge structure if the representation E is real. However $\mathbf{E}\otimes_{\mathbf{R}}\mathbf{C}$ does underlie a real polarizable variation of Hodge structure so Saito's decomposition theorem applies to it. Now $\mathbf{E}\otimes_{\mathbf{R}}\mathbf{C} \cong \mathbf{E}\oplus\overline{\mathbf{E}}$ and one can prove that the decomposition theorem holds for a direct sum if and only if it holds for each summand.

type. We have the following extension of the decomposition theorem despite $\widehat{X}$ not being algebraic:

Theorem (Decomposition theorem for $\pi\colon \widehat{X} \to X^*$)**.** *Let* $\mathbf{E}$ *be an irreducible local system on a stratum* X_P *of* $\widehat{X}$ *which is induced from an algebraic representation of* L_P*. Let* p *be a middle perversity. Then*

$$\pi_*\mathcal{P}_{p,X_P}(\mathbf{E}) = \bigoplus_i \mathcal{P}_{F_{P^\dagger}}(\mathbf{H}^i(\widehat{X}_{P,\ell}; \mathcal{P}_{p,X_{P,\ell}}(\mathbf{E})))[-i] \ . \tag{1.2}$$

Note that while the left-hand side a priori depends on the choice of middle perversity, the right-hand side does not since X^* has only even-dimensional strata. Also the theorem makes it clear that π_* is not injective on objects since the map $P \mapsto P^\dagger$ is not injective.

Here is a sketch of the proof. It suffices to pass to a finite cover so one can arrange that $X_P = X_{P,\ell} \times F_{P^\dagger}$ whence $\widehat{X}_P = \widehat{X}_{P,\ell} \times \widehat{F}_{P^\dagger}$, with $\pi|_{\widehat{X}_P}$ being projection on the second factor. Now apply the Künneth formula of Cohen, Goresky, and Ji [12] (which one checks is applicable for middle perversities) and apply Rapoport's conjecture to the second factor.

1.5. **Summary of this paper.** The theorem above shows that it is reasonable to study the category of reductively constructible perverse sheaves on the Baily-Borel compactification X^* by studying the category of perverse sheaves on the reductive Borel-Serre compactification $\widehat{X}$. By the above version of the decomposition theorem, we understand π_* on simple objects; the goal of this very modest paper is to begin to understand extensions better in this context. After recalling the basics of t-structures in §2, we carefully define middle perversity perverse sheaves on a stratified pseudomanifold in §3, playing special attention to the issues that arise due to odd dimensional strata. We also note certain non-trivial extensions that arise due to odd codimension strata. In §4 we indicate how one may calculate extensions between two simple perverse sheaves. After discussing needed background on the reductive Borel-Serre compactification in §5 and the link cohomology of simple perverse sheaves in §6, we conclude in §7 by doing the exercise of calculating all extensions between simple perverse sheaves for $\widehat{\mathcal{A}_2}$, the reductive Borel-Serre compactification of the moduli of principally polarized abelian surfaces.

1.6. **A potential application: perverse cohomology.** One reason to better understand extensions is to be able to calculate the *perverse cohomology* of an object $\mathcal{S}$ in $\mathbf{D}^b_{rc}(\widehat{X})$ (or $\pi_*\mathcal{S}$ in $\mathbf{D}^b_{rc}(X^*)$), the reductively constructible bounded derived category of sheaves. Recall that the definition of a perverse sheaf started with sheaves as the basic objects, proceeded to the derived category, and within it found the abelian category $\mathbf{P}(Y)$ of perverse sheaves. Thus a perverse sheaf is represented as a complex of ordinary sheaves. However it has become clear that it is also useful to view perverse sheaves themselves as the basic objects and in some cases the roles of the two types of objects can be reversed. Beilinson [4] shows that if Y is an algebraic variety and we consider all algebraic stratifications (not a fixed one), then the bounded derived category of $\mathbf{P}(Y)$ is equivalent to $\mathbf{D}^b_c(Y)$ within which one finds the category of ordinary constructible sheaves. Thus in this setting, a constructible sheaf, or in fact any object $\mathcal{S}$ of $\mathbf{D}^b_c(Y)$, can be represented as a complex of perverse sheaves $\cdots \to \mathcal{P}^{i-1} \to \mathcal{P}^i \to \mathcal{P}^{i+1} \to \ldots$. The cohomology of this complex $H^i(\mathcal{P}^\cdot)$ is a perverse sheaf called the perverse cohomology ${}^pH^i(\mathcal{S})$.

Even when Beilinson's theorem does not apply, as it does not for $\widehat{X}$ since we have fixed a stratification, the perverse cohomology can be defined as ${}^pH^i(\mathcal{S}) = {}^p\tau_{\le 0}{}^p\tau_{\ge 0}\mathcal{S}[i]$. Furthermore, just like for the ordinary cohomology sheaves of a complex of sheaves, there is a spectral sequence with $E_2^{ij} = H^j(Y; {}^pH^i(\mathcal{S}))$ that abuts to $H^{i+j}(Y;\mathcal{S})$. Many important invariants of X are realized as the cohomology of complexes of sheaves on $\widehat{X}$, for example, the cohomology of the arithmetic group is $H^\cdot(\Gamma; E) = H^\cdot(\widehat{X}; i_{X*}\mathbf{E})$. Thus calculating ${}^pH^i(\mathcal{S})$, or at least having bounds on the degrees in which $H^\cdot(\widehat{X}; {}^pH^i(\mathcal{S}))$ can be nonzero, is important.

One potential approach to calculating, or at least approximating, the perverse cohomology of $\mathcal{S}$ is through its *micro-support*. In [40, §7], we defined the micro-support $\mathrm{SS}(\mathcal{S})$ and proved a vanishing theorem [40, §10] for $H^\cdot(\widehat{X};\mathcal{S})$ based on $\mathrm{SS}(\mathcal{S})$. As an application, we were able to prove [42], for example, that in the Hermitian case, $H^i(\Gamma;\mathbf{E}) = 0$ for $i < (1/2)\dim X$ provided E had regular highest weight; this result was independently proved by Li and Schwermer [28] by different methods.

We also determined [40, §17] the micro-support of a simple perverse sheaf $\mathcal{P}_{X_P}(\mathbf{E})$ provided the $\mathbf{Q}$-root system of L_P did not have a factor of type D_n, F_4, or E_n (a restriction that should be removable). The result shows that if a perverse sheaf is semi-simple and satisfies a certain conjugate self-contragredient assumption on the coefficients, the micro-support determines the perverse sheaf. In fact we will show elsewhere that under certain conditions, even for a not necessarily semi-simple perverse sheaf, the micro-support determines the simple constituents and thus potentially the micro-support can be used as a tool to calculate the perverse cohomology.

1.7. **Acknowledgments.** I would like to thank Amnon Neeman for helpful discussions regarding extensions. I would also like to thank Lizhen Ji, Steve Zucker, and an expert anonymous referee for thoughtful comments concerning this paper. Needless to say, any failings of this paper are solely due to myself.

It was a great honor to be invited to speak at the birthday conference for Steve Zucker and to contribute to this volume. Steve has always been a source of inspiration and encouragement to me. When I was a graduate student and he was a visitor at the Institute, I remember him sitting down with me in the common room and carefully showing me the derivation of the Poincaré punctured disk metric. In later encounters he always took a deep interest in my work which I appreciated. I also enjoyed long evenings with him spent listening to classical music as well as many delicious meals (particularly Maryland crabs whacked open with a wooden mallet!).

Notation. Morphisms in a category $\mathbf{C}$ will be denoted $\mathrm{Mor}_{\mathbf{C}}(A,B)$; when $\mathbf{C}$ is a category of representations of a group G, we simply write $\mathrm{Mor}_G(A,B)$.

If A is an object of some derived category of sheaves on a space Y and $V \subset Y$ is an open subset, we will sometimes abuse notation and also denote by A the inverse image of A to the derived category of sheaves on V, that is $A|_V$.

If $S \subset Y$, we let $i_S\colon S \hookrightarrow Y$ denote the inclusion; we use the same notation to denote the inclusion into any subset of Y containing S. If V is an open subset of Y containing S for which S is closed in V, we let $j_S\colon U = V \setminus S \hookrightarrow V$. We thus have inclusions of complementary open and closed subsets

$$U \xhookrightarrow{j_S} V \xhookleftarrow{i_S} S\ . \tag{1.3}$$

Often S is a stratum of a stratification of Y and V is an open union of strata for which S is a minimal stratum.

If S, $S' \subset Y$, we write $S \preccurlyeq S'$ if $S \subseteq \overline{S'}$ and $S \prec S'$ if $S \subsetneq \overline{S'}$.

2. t-STRUCTURES

We briefly recall the theory of t-structures on a triangulated category $\mathbf{D}$ following [5, §1.3].

A *t-structure* on $\mathbf{D}$ consists of two full subcategories $\mathbf{D}^{\leq 0}$ and $\mathbf{D}^{\geq 0}$, closed under isomorphism, satisfying the following conditions. First set $\mathbf{D}^{\leq k} = \mathbf{D}^{\leq 0}[-k]$ and $\mathbf{D}^{\geq k} = \mathbf{D}^{\geq 0}[-k]$. We require

$$\mathrm{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}}(A, B) = 0 \text{ for } A \in \mathbf{D}^{\leq 0},\ B \in \mathbf{D}^{\geq 1}. \tag{2.1}$$

Secondly we require that

$$\mathbf{D}^{\leq 0} \subseteq \mathbf{D}^{\leq 1} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathbf{D}^{\geq 0} \supseteq \mathbf{D}^{\geq 1}\ . \tag{2.2}$$

And finally we assume that for any object $X \in \mathbf{D}$, there exists a distinguished triangle

$$A \to X \to B \xrightarrow{[1]} \qquad (A \in \mathbf{D}^{\leq 0},\ B \in \mathbf{D}^{\geq 1}). \tag{2.3}$$

In fact the distinguished triangle above is unique up to unique isomorphism and one can use it to define truncation functors $\tau_{\leq 0}X = A$ and $\tau_{\geq 1}X = B$. By shifting we obtain truncation functors $\tau_{\leq k}\colon \mathbf{D} \to \mathbf{D}^{\leq k}$ and $\tau_{\geq k}\colon \mathbf{D} \to \mathbf{D}^{\geq k}$ for all $k \in \mathbf{Z}$. There are natural morphisms $\tau_{\leq k} \to \mathrm{id}$ and $\mathrm{id} \to \tau_{\geq k}$, which induce adjoint relations

$$\mathrm{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}}(A, B) \cong \mathrm{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}^{\leq k}}(A, \tau_{\leq k}B) \qquad (A \in \mathbf{D}^{\leq k},\ B \in \mathbf{D}) \tag{2.4}$$

$$\mathrm{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}}(A, B) \cong \mathrm{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}^{\geq k}}(\tau_{\geq k}A, B) \qquad (A \in \mathbf{D},\ B \in \mathbf{D}^{\geq k}). \tag{2.5}$$

The *heart* of a t-structure is $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{D}^{\leq 0} \cap \mathbf{D}^{\geq 0}$. It is a full abelian subcategory of $\mathbf{D}$. Furthermore, a short exact sequence $0 \to C' \to C \to C'' \to 0$ in $\mathbf{C}$ corresponds to a distinguished triangle $C' \to C \to C'' \xrightarrow{[1]}$ in $\mathbf{D}$ with all objects belonging to $\mathbf{C}$ and vice-versa. Thus $\mathrm{Ext}^1_{\mathbf{C}}(C'', C') = \mathrm{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}}(C'', C'[1])$.

The functor $H^0\colon \mathbf{D} \to \mathbf{C}$ given by $H^0(A) = \tau_{\geq 0}\tau_{\leq 0}A = \tau_{\leq 0}\tau_{\geq 0}A$ is a cohomological functor. We set $H^k(A) = H^0(A[k])$

Lemma 2.1. *If $A \in \mathbf{D}^{\leq k}$ and $B \in \mathbf{D}^{\geq k}$, then $\mathrm{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}}(A, B) \cong \mathrm{Mor}_{\mathbf{C}}(H^k(A), H^k(B))$.*

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}}(A, B) &= \mathrm{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}}(\tau_{\leq k}A, B) && (A = \tau_{\leq k}A \text{ since } A \in \mathbf{D}^{\leq k}A)\\
&= \mathrm{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}}(\tau_{\geq k}\tau_{\leq k}A, B) && (\text{by (2.5) since } B \in \mathbf{D}^{\geq k})\\
&= \mathrm{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}}(H^k(A)[-k], B)\ .
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly one may replace B here by $H^k(B)[-k]$ whence the lemma since $\mathbf{C}$ is full. □

In this paper, $\mathbf{D}$ will be the constructible bounded derived category of sheaves on a stratified pseudomanifold Y. The *standard t-structure* has $\mathbf{D}^{\leq 0}$ consisting of objects $\mathcal{S}$ satisfying

$$H^k(\mathcal{S}) = 0 \text{ for } k > 0\ , \tag{2.6}$$

and $\mathbf{D}^{\leq 0}$ consisting of objects $\mathcal{S}$ satisfying

$$H^k(\mathcal{S}) = 0 \text{ for } k < 0\ . \tag{2.7}$$

In this case, the truncation functors are the usual truncations of a complex, and objects in the heart may be represented by constructible sheaves viewed as complexes with only one nonzero term in degree 0.

In §3 we will define the perverse t-structure whose heart is the category of perverse sheaves. The subcategories, truncation functors, and cohomology functors for this t-structure will always be distinguished by a left superscript p, as in ${}^p\mathbf{D}^{\leq 0}$.

3. Perverse sheaves

3.1. **Definition.** Let Y be a stratified topological pseudomanifold of dimension n with stratification $\mathcal{X} = \{S\}$. We will assume that all strata of Y are connected which implies that the frontier condition holds: the closure of any stratum is a union of strata. We also assume that there are finitely many strata. The strata of Y are partially ordered by $S \preccurlyeq T$ if and only if $S \subseteq \overline{T}$.

We now briefly recall the definition of the category of perverse sheaves on Y following [5, §2.1].

Fix a $\mathbf{Z}$-valued function p on the set of strata, the *perversity* (in the sense of [5]); we assume the perversity satisfies $p(S) \geq p(T)$ when $S \preccurlyeq T$. Our main interest is when p is one of the two *middle perversities*:

$$p_-(S) = -\left\lfloor \frac{\dim S + 1}{2} \right\rfloor , \qquad p_+(S) = -\left\lfloor \frac{\dim S}{2} \right\rfloor . \tag{3.1}$$

If Y has only even dimensional strata, both p_- and p_+ are equal to the self-dual perversity $p_{1/2}(S) = -(1/2)\dim S$. (A non-middle perversity is introduced in §6.4 for technical reasons.)

Let $\mathbf{D}^b_c(Y)$ denote the bounded derived category of $\mathbf{C}$-sheaves on Y, constructible with respect to $\mathcal{X}$. (For an algebraic variety one usually does not fix a stratification, but since our main focus here is $Y = \widehat{X}$ it seems appropriate.) An object in $\mathbf{D}^b_c(Y)$ may be represented by a complex of sheaves $\mathcal{S}$ on Y whose local cohomology sheaves $H(i_S^*\mathcal{S})$ along a stratum S are locally constant and finitely generated; such a locally constant sheaf may be equivalently viewed as a $\pi_1(S)$-module, once we have picked as base point in S (omitted in the notation). Since Y is a stratified pseudomanifold, it can be shown that $H(i_S^!\mathcal{S})$ is likewise locally constant and finitely generated [9, V,§3].

Define the full subcategory ${}^p\mathbf{D}^{\leq 0}_c(Y)$ of $\mathbf{D}^b_c(Y)$ to consist of objects $\mathcal{S}$ which satisfy

$$H^k(i_S^*\mathcal{S}) = 0 \text{ for } k > p(S), \text{ for all strata } S \ ; \tag{3.2}$$

Likewise define ${}^p\mathbf{D}^{\geq 0}_c(Y)$ to consist of objects $\mathcal{S}$ which satisfy

$$H^k(i_S^!\mathcal{S}) = 0 \text{ for } k < p(S), \text{ for all strata } S \ . \tag{3.3}$$

We refer to (3.2) and (3.3) as the *perverse vanishing* condition and the *perverse covanishing* condition respectively. As usual, we let ${}^p\mathbf{D}^{\leq k}_c(Y) = {}^p\mathbf{D}^{\leq 0}_c(Y)[-k]$ and ${}^p\mathbf{D}^{\geq k}_c(Y) = {}^p\mathbf{D}^{\geq 0}_c(Y)[-k]$.

The pair $({}^p\mathbf{D}^{\leq 0}_c(Y), {}^p\mathbf{D}^{\geq 0}_c(Y))$ forms a t-structure; its heart, ${}^p\mathbf{D}^{\leq 0}_c(Y) \cap {}^p\mathbf{D}^{\geq 0}_c(Y)$, is the category of *$p$-perverse sheaves* on Y, denoted $\mathbf{P}(Y) = \mathbf{P}_p(Y)$. For $p = p_-$ (resp. p_+) we simply write $\mathbf{P}_-(Y)$ (resp. $\mathbf{P}_+(Y)$).

For $\mathcal{S} \in \mathbf{D}^b_c(Y)$, $D_S(i_S^!\mathcal{S}) = i_S^* D_Y(\mathcal{S})$ where D_Y and D_S denote the respective Verdier duality involutions. Set

$$p^*(S) = -p(S) - \dim S \ ,$$

the *dual* perversity. Then D_Y sends p-perverse sheaves to p^*-perverse sheaves. From (3.1) we see that $p_-(S) + p_+(S) = -\dim S$ and thus $p_-^* = p_+$ and $p_+^* = p_-$. In particular, D_Y interchanges $\mathbf{P}_-(Y)$ and $\mathbf{P}_+(Y)$.

Warning. In §5.2, after introducing the reductive Borel-Serre compactification, we will impose a condition we call *reductively constructible* on our objects which is more appropriate to use on $\widehat{X}$. All of the material of the current section as well as §4 hold without change under the assumption of reductively constructible (with a minor exception noted later).

3.2. **Simple perverse sheaves.** For every stratum T of Y and every irreducible local system $\mathbf{E}$ on T (corresponding to an irreducible representation E of $\pi_1(T)$) there is a simple object

$$\mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E}) = \mathcal{P}_{p,T}(\mathbf{E}) = \tau_{\le p(S_1)-1} j_{S_1 *} \dots \tau_{\le p(S_N)-1} j_{S_N *} (i_{T*}\mathbf{E}[-p(T)]) \tag{3.4}$$

of $\mathbf{P}(Y)$ and these are all the simple objects. Here $S_1, \dots, S_N$ is an enumeration of the strata $S \prec T$ such that if $S_i \prec S_j$ then $i < j$.

$\mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E})$ is supported on $\overline{T}$ and satisfies the usual perverse vanishing and covanishing condition on T:

$$H^k(i_T^* \mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E})) = 0 \text{ for } k > p(T) \text{ and } H^k(i_T^! \mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E})) = 0 \text{ for } k < p(T) \ .$$

In fact, $i_T^* \mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E}) = i_T^! \mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E}) = \mathbf{E}[-p(T)]$. However $\mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E})$ satisfies stronger conditions on strata smaller than T:

$$H^k(i_S^* \mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E})) = 0 \text{ for } k \ge p(S), \text{ for all strata } S \prec T \tag{3.5}$$

and

$$H^k(i_S^! \mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E})) = 0 \text{ for } k \le p(S), \text{ for all strata } S \prec T \ . \tag{3.6}$$

We call (3.5) and (3.6) the *intersection cohomology vanishing* condition and the *intersection cohomology covanishing* condition respectively.

Let S be a stratum of Y, V_S an open union of strata containing S as a minimal stratum, and $j_S \colon U_S = V_S \setminus S \hookrightarrow V_S$. Define the *link cohomology functor* $\kappa_S \colon \mathbf{D}_c^b(U_S) \to \mathbf{D}_c^b(S)$ by

$$\kappa_S A = i_S^* j_{S*} A \ .$$

The local cohomology of $\kappa_S A$ is the cohomology of A pulled back to the topological link of the stratum S. If A is defined on a subset larger than U_S, for example Y, we write $\kappa_S A$ for $\kappa_S(A|_{U_S})$. Thus it fits into a distinguished triangle for $A \in \mathbf{D}_c^b(Y)$:

$$i_S^! A \to i_S^* A \to \kappa_S A \xrightarrow{[1]} \ .$$

Now the values of the cohomology groups appearing in (3.5) and (3.6) in the other degrees can be easily calculated:

$$H^k(i_S^* \mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E})) \cong H^k(\kappa_S \mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E})) \text{ for } k < p(S), \text{ for all strata } S \prec T \tag{3.7}$$

and

$$H^k(i_S^! \mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E})) = H^{k-1}(\kappa_S \mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E})) \text{ for } k > p(S), \text{ for all strata } S \prec T \ . \tag{3.8}$$

All degrees of the $\mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E})$-cohomology of the link of S appear, split between $i_S^* \mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E})$ and (with a shift) $i_S^! \mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E})$.

3.3. **Comparison with intersection cohomology.** Assume p is one of the middle perversities p_- or p_+. Define

$$\bar{p}_T(S) = p(S) - p(T) - 1, \qquad (S \preccurlyeq T)\ . \tag{3.9}$$

Then by pulling out the shift in (3.4) we see that

$$\mathcal{P}_{p,T}(\mathbf{E}) = \mathcal{I}_{\bar{p}_T}\mathcal{C}(\overline{T}, \mathbf{E})[-p(T)]$$

where for $\bar{p}\colon \mathcal{X}(\overline{T}) \to \mathbf{Z}$ we set

$$\mathcal{I}_{\bar{p}}\mathcal{C}(\overline{T}, \mathbf{E}) = \tau_{\le \bar{p}(S_1)} j_{S_1 *} \dots \tau_{\le \bar{p}(S_N)} j_{S_N *} i_{T *} \mathbf{E}\ . \tag{3.10}$$

When $\bar{p}(S)$ depends only on $k = \operatorname{codim}_T S$, as is the case for $\bar{p}_T(S)$ from (3.9), the object $\mathcal{I}_{\bar{p}}\mathcal{C}(\overline{T}, \mathbf{E})$ is essentially Deligne's sheaf for intersection cohomology as in [9, V].

In fact $\bar{p}_T(S)$ agrees with one of the two "classical" middle perversities of Goresky and MacPherson [20]:

$$m(k) = \left\lfloor \frac{k-2}{2} \right\rfloor, \qquad n(k) = \left\lfloor \frac{k-1}{2} \right\rfloor.$$

Specifically for $p = p_-$,

$$\bar{p}_T(S) = \begin{cases} n(\operatorname{codim}_T S) & \text{if } \dim T \text{ is odd,} \\ m(\operatorname{codim}_T S) & \text{if } \dim T \text{ is even,} \end{cases}$$

and for $p = p_+$,

$$\bar{p}_T(S) = \begin{cases} m(\operatorname{codim}_T S) & \text{if } \dim T \text{ is odd,} \\ n(\operatorname{codim}_T S) & \text{if } \dim T \text{ is even,} \end{cases}$$

Thus $\mathcal{P}_{p,T}(\mathbf{E}) = \mathcal{I}_{\bar{p}_T}\mathcal{C}(\overline{T}, \mathbf{E})[-p(T)]$ is either $\mathcal{I}_m\mathcal{C}(\overline{T}, \mathbf{E})[-p(T)]$ or $\mathcal{I}_n\mathcal{C}(\overline{T}, \mathbf{E})[-p(T)]$ depending on the parity of $\dim T$.

3.4. **A non-trivial extension of perverse sheaves.** Let p be a middle perversity and let $\mathbf{E}$ be an irreducible local system on a stratum T of Y. While $\mathcal{P}_{p,T}(\mathbf{E}) = \mathcal{I}_{\bar{p}_T}\mathcal{C}(\overline{T}, \mathbf{E})[-p(T)]$ is a simple perverse sheaf in $\mathbf{P}_p(Y)$, in fact the object

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{p,T}(\mathbf{E}) \equiv \mathcal{P}_{p^*,T}(\mathbf{E})[p^*(T) - p(T)] = \mathcal{I}_{\overline{p^*}_T}\mathcal{C}(\overline{T}, \mathbf{E})[-p(T)]$$

is also a perverse sheaf in $\mathbf{P}_p(Y)$, though not necessarily simple.

To see this, note that the p-perversity condition on the stratum T is satisfied due to the shift. To deal with the other strata, note first that for a middle perversity

$$p^*(S) - p(S) \in \begin{cases} \{0, 1\} & \text{if } p = p_-, \\ \{0, -1\} & \text{if } p = p_+, \end{cases}$$

for any stratum S; here the value 0 occurs if and only if $\dim S$ is even. Consequently

$$-1 \le (p^*(S) - p(S)) - (p^*(T) - p(T)) \le 1 \tag{3.11}$$

for all strata S and T. Now for $S \prec T$, the intersection cohomology vanishing condition (3.5) with respect to p^* implies that

$$H^k(i_S^* \mathcal{P}_{p^*,T}(\mathbf{E})[p^*(T) - p(T)]) = 0 \text{ for } k \ge p^*(S) - (p^*(T) - p(T)).$$

This implies the p-perverse vanishing condition (3.2) for $k > p(S)$ since

$$k \ge p(S) + 1 \ge p(S) + (p^*(S) - p(S)) - (p^*(T) - p(T)) = p^*(S) - (p^*(T) - p(T))$$

by (3.11). The p-perverse covanishing condition (3.3) follows similarly.

The natural morphism $\mathcal{I}_m\mathcal{C}(\overline{T},\mathbf{E})[-p(T)] \to \mathcal{I}_n\mathcal{C}(\overline{T},\mathbf{E})[-p(T)]$ thus induces short exact sequences

$$0 \to \mathcal{P}_{p,T}(\mathbf{E}) \to \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{p,T}(\mathbf{E}) \to \mathcal{P} \to 0 \qquad (\text{if } \bar{p}_T = m)$$

or

$$0 \to \mathcal{P} \to \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{p,T}(\mathbf{E}) \to \mathcal{P}_{p,T}(\mathbf{E}) \to 0 \qquad (\text{if } \bar{p}_T = n)$$

in $\mathbf{P}_p(Y)$ and hence extensions in $\mathbf{P}_p(Y)$.

If $\mathcal{P}_{p,T}(\mathbf{E}) \neq \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{p,T}(\mathbf{E})$, the resulting extensions are not trivial. For if $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{p,T}(\mathbf{E}) = \mathcal{P}\oplus\mathcal{P}_{p,T}(\mathbf{E})$ in $\mathbf{P}_p(Y)$, then applying i_S^* or $i_S^!$ and shifting by $p(T)-p^*(T)$, we see that $\mathcal{P}[p(T)-p^*(T)]$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{p^*,T}(\mathbf{E}) = \mathcal{P}_{p,T}(\mathbf{E})[p(T)-p^*(T)]$ satisfy the p^*-perverse conditions (since $\mathcal{P}_{p^*,T}(\mathbf{E}) = \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{p,T}(\mathbf{E})[p(T)-p^*(T)]$ does). This implies that $\mathcal{P}_{p^*,T}(\mathbf{E}) = \mathcal{P}[p(T)-p^*(T)] \oplus \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{p^*,T}(\mathbf{E})$ in $\mathbf{P}_{p^*}(Y)$, contradicting the fact that $\mathcal{P}_{p^*,T}(\mathbf{E})$ is simple in $\mathbf{P}_{p^*}(Y)$.

Remarks. (i) The inequality $\mathcal{P}_{p,T}(\mathbf{E}) \neq \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{p,T}(\mathbf{E})$ will occur precisely when there is a odd codimension stratum $S \prec T$ with nonvanishing middle degree link cohomology

$$H^k(\kappa_S\mathcal{P}_{p,T}(\mathbf{E})) \neq 0 \qquad (k = (\operatorname{codim}_T S - 1)/2 + p(T)).$$

(ii) If $Y = \widehat{X}$, the reductive Borel-Serre compactification of a locally symmetric variety, and $\mathbf{E}$ is induced from an algebraic representation of L_T, then decomposition theorem for $\pi\colon \widehat{X} \to X^*$ (see §1.4) implies that this extension always becomes trivial when pushed down to the Baily-Borel compactification. In fact $\pi_*\mathcal{P}_{p,X}(\mathbf{E}) = \pi_*\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{p,X}(\mathbf{E})$ by the solution to Rapoport's conjecture [40] since it applies to both middle perversities and they agree on X^*; more generally the theorem shows that $\pi_*\mathcal{P}_{p,X_P}(\mathbf{E})$ and $\pi_*\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{p,X_P}(\mathbf{E})$ differ only in the coefficient system, but in the reductively constructible setting, the category of coefficient systems on a stratum is semisimple.

(iii) When $Y = \widehat{X}$ (with X not necessarily Hermitian), the inequality $\mathcal{P}_{p,T}(\mathbf{E}) \neq \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{p,T}(\mathbf{E})$ has an intimate relation with the presence of infinite dimensional local L^2-cohomology on $\widehat{X}$.

4. Extensions

Fix a perversity p (not necessarily middle). In this section we indicate how one may compute the extensions $\operatorname{Ext}^1_{\mathbf{P}(Y)}(\mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E}),\mathcal{P}_{T'}(\mathbf{E}'))$ between two simple perverse sheaves corresponding to strata T, $T' \in \mathcal{X}(Y)$. Note that by the theory of t-structures,

$$\operatorname{Ext}^1_{\mathbf{P}(Y)}(\mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E}),\mathcal{P}_{T'}(\mathbf{E}')) = \operatorname{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}^b_c(Y)}(\mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E}),\mathcal{P}_{T'}(\mathbf{E}')[1]) \ .$$

Lemma 4.1. *Let V be an open union of strata with S a minimal stratum of V; set $U = V\setminus S$. For A, $B \in \mathbf{D}^b_c(V)$ and $k \in \mathbf{Z}$, assume* $\operatorname{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}^b_c(U)}(j_S^*A, j_S^*B[k-1]) = \operatorname{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}^b_c(U)}(j_S^*A, j_S^*B[k]) = 0$. *Then* $\operatorname{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}^b_c(V)}(A, B[k]) \cong \operatorname{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}^b_c(S)}(i_S^*A, i_S^!B[k])$.

Proof. The distinguished triangle $i_{S*}i_S^!B \to B \to j_{S*}j_S^*B \xrightarrow{[1]}$ yields a long exact sequence

$$\operatorname{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}^b_c(V)}(A, j_{S*}j_S^*B[k-1]) \longrightarrow \operatorname{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}^b_c(V)}(A, i_{S*}i_S^!B[k]) \longrightarrow$$
$$\operatorname{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}^b_c(V)}(A, B[k]) \longrightarrow \operatorname{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}^b_c(V)}(A, j_{S*}j_S^*B[k]) \ .$$

The outer two groups are zero by hypothesis, thus

$$\mathrm{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}^b_c(V)}(A, B[k]) \cong \mathrm{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}^b_c(V)}(A, i_{S*}i_S^! B[k]) \cong \mathrm{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}^b_c(S)}(i_S^* A, i_S^! B[k]) \ . \qquad \square$$

Lemma 4.2. *If all maximal strata of $\overline{T} \cap \overline{T'}$ are strictly smaller than T and T', then $\mathrm{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}^b_c(Y)}(\mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E}), \mathcal{P}_{T'}(\mathbf{E}')[k]) = 0$ for $k \leq 1$.*

Proof. Let V be an open union of strata containing $Y \setminus \overline{T} \cap \overline{T'}$. We will prove that

$$\mathrm{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}^b_c(V)}(\mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E}), \mathcal{P}_{T'}(\mathbf{E}')[k]) = 0, \qquad k \leq 1,$$

by induction on the number of strata in V. When $V = Y$ this proves the lemma.

If $V = Y \setminus \overline{T} \cap \overline{T'}$, the supports of $\mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E})$ and $\mathcal{P}_{T'}(\mathbf{E}')$ are disjoint and

$$\mathrm{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}^b_c(V)}(\mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E}), \mathcal{P}_{T'}(\mathbf{E}')[k]) = 0, \qquad \text{for all } k.$$

For larger V, let S be a minimal stratum in $V \cap (\overline{T} \cap \overline{T'})$ and set $U = V \setminus S$. By Lemma 4.1 (which applies by the inductive hypothesis)

$$\mathrm{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}^b_c(V)}(\mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E}), \mathcal{P}_{T'}(\mathbf{E}')[k]) \cong \mathrm{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}^b_c(S)}(i_S^* \mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E}), i_S^! \mathcal{P}_{T'}(\mathbf{E}')[k]) \ .$$

for $k \leq 1$. Since S is dominated by a maximal stratum in $\overline{T} \cap \overline{T'}$ which is thus strictly smaller than T and T', the intersection cohomology vanishing and covanishing conditions apply to yield $i_S^* \mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E}) \in \mathbf{D}_c^{\leq p(S)-1}(S)$ and $i_S^! \mathcal{P}_{T'}(\mathbf{E}')[k] \in \mathbf{D}_c^{\geq p(S)+1-k}(S)$. Now $p(S)-1 < p(S)+1-k$ for $k \leq 1$, so $\mathrm{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}^b_c(S)}(i_S^* \mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E}), i_S^! \mathcal{P}_{T'}(\mathbf{E}')[k]) = 0$ by (2.1). $\square$

We conclude that a non-trivial extension can only exist when $T = T'$, $T \prec T'$, or $T \succ T'$.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $V_T = (Y \setminus \overline{T}) \cup T$ and similarly for T'.*

(i) *If $T = T'$, $\mathrm{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}^b_c(V_T)}(\mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E}), \mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E}')[1]) \cong \mathrm{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}^b_c(T)}(\mathbf{E}, \mathbf{E}'[1])$.*

(ii) *If $T \prec T'$, $\mathrm{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}^b_c(V_T)}(\mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E}), \mathcal{P}_{T'}(\mathbf{E}')[1]) \cong \mathrm{Mor}_{\pi_1(T)}(E, H^{p(T)}(\kappa_T \mathcal{P}_{T'}(\mathbf{E}')))$.*

(iii) *If $T \succ T'$, $\mathrm{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}^b_c(V_{T'})}(\mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E}), \mathcal{P}_{T'}(\mathbf{E}')[1]) \cong \mathrm{Mor}_{\pi_1(T')}(H^{p(T')-1}(\kappa_{T'} \mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E})), E')$.*

Proof. The case $T = T'$ follows from Lemma 4.1. For $T \prec T'$ we calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}^b_c(V_T)}(\mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E}), \mathcal{P}_{T'}(\mathbf{E}')[1]) &\cong \mathrm{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}^b_c(T)}(\mathbf{E}[-p(T)], i_T^! \mathcal{P}_{T'}(\mathbf{E}')[1]) \quad \text{(by Lemma 4.1)} \\
&\cong \mathrm{Mor}_{\pi_1(T)}(E, H^{p(T)+1}(i_T^! \mathcal{P}_{T'}(\mathbf{E}'))) \quad \text{(by (3.6) and Lemma 2.1)} \\
&\cong \mathrm{Mor}_{\pi_1(T)}(E, H^{p(T)}(\kappa_T \mathcal{P}_{T'}(\mathbf{E}'))) \qquad \text{by (3.8)}
\end{aligned}$$

The case where $T \succ T'$ is similar. $\square$

Lemma 4.4. *Assume $S \prec T$ and $S \prec T'$. Let V be an open union of strata with $S \subset V$ a minimal stratum and set $U = V \setminus S$. A morphism $\phi_U \in \mathrm{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}^b_c(U)}(j_S^* \mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E}), j_S^* \mathcal{P}_{T'}(\mathbf{E}')[1])$ prolongs to a morphism ϕ_V over V if and only if*

$$H^{p(S)-1}(\kappa_S(\phi_U)) = 0 \text{ in } \mathrm{Mor}_{\pi_1(S)}(H^{p(S)-1}(\kappa_S \mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E})), H^{p(S)}(\kappa_S \mathcal{P}_{T'}(\mathbf{E}'))) \ . \tag{4.1}$$

If this prolongation exists it is unique.

Proof. We apply $\mathrm{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}^b_c(V)}(\mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E}), \cdot)$ to the distinguished triangle $i_{S*}i_S^! \mathcal{P}_{T'}(\mathbf{E}') \to \mathcal{P}_{T'}(\mathbf{E}') \to i_{S*}j_S^* \mathcal{P}_{T'}(\mathbf{E}') \xrightarrow{[1]}$ which yields, after using adjointness, the long exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}^b_c(S)}(i_S^* \mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E}), i_S^! \mathcal{P}_{T'}(\mathbf{E}')[1]) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}^b_c(V)}(\mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E}), \mathcal{P}_{T'}(\mathbf{E}')[1]) \longrightarrow \\
\mathrm{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}^b_c(U)}(j_S^* \mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E}), j_S^* \mathcal{P}_{T'}(\mathbf{E}')[1]) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}^b_c(S)}(i_S^* \mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E}), i_S^! \mathcal{P}_{T'}(\mathbf{E}')[2]) \ .
\end{aligned}$$

Since $i_S^*\mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E}) \in \mathbf{D}_c^{\leq p(S)-1}(S)$ by (3.5) and $i_S^!\mathcal{P}_{T'}(\mathbf{E}')[1] \in \mathbf{D}_c^{\geq p(S)}(S)$ by (3.6), the leftmost term is 0 by (2.1). This shows that ϕ_V is unique if it exists. It exists if and only if ϕ_U maps to zero in the last term, which by a similar calculation and using Lemma 2.1 is

$$\mathrm{Mor}_{\pi_1(S)}(H^{p(S)-1}(i_S^*\mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E})), H^{p(S)-1}(i_S^!\mathcal{P}_{T'}(\mathbf{E}')[2])) \ .$$

By (3.7) and (3.8) this is the group of morphisms in (4.1). □

Note that the map on link cohomology at S which needs to be zero in order to prolong an extension is the map from the highest degree of link cohomology occurring in $i_S^*\mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E})$ to the lowest degree of link cohomology that does *not* occur in $i_S^*\mathcal{P}_{T'}(\mathbf{E}')$.

This section is summarized in the following

Proposition 4.5. $\mathrm{Ext}^1_{\mathbf{P}(Y)}(\mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E}), \mathcal{P}_{T'}(\mathbf{E}'))$ *is zero unless* $T = T'$, $T \prec T'$ *or* $T \succ T'$.

(i) *For* $T = T'$, $\mathrm{Ext}^1_{\mathbf{P}(Y)}(\mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E}), \mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E}'))$ *is isomorphic to a subgroup of*

$$\mathrm{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}^b_c(V_T)}(\mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E}), \mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E}')[1]) \cong \mathrm{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}^b_c(T)}(\mathbf{E}, \mathbf{E}'[1]) \ .$$

(ii) *For* $T \prec T'$, $\mathrm{Ext}^1_{\mathbf{P}(Y)}(\mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E}), \mathcal{P}_{T'}(\mathbf{E}'))$ *is isomorphic to a subgroup of*

$$\mathrm{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}^b_c(V_T)}(\mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E}), \mathcal{P}_{T'}(\mathbf{E}')[1]) \cong \mathrm{Mor}_{\pi_1(T)}(E, H^{p(T)}(\kappa_T\mathcal{P}_{T'}(\mathbf{E}'))) \ .$$

(iii) *For* $T \succ T'$, $\mathrm{Ext}^1_{\mathbf{P}(Y)}(\mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E}), \mathcal{P}_{T'}(\mathbf{E}'))$ *is isomorphic to a subgroup of*

$$\mathrm{Mor}_{\mathbf{D}^b_c(V_{T'})}(\mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E}), \mathcal{P}_{T'}(\mathbf{E}')[1]) \cong \mathrm{Mor}_{\pi_1(T')}(H^{p(T')-1}(\kappa_{T'}\mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E})), E') \ .$$

In either case, the group of extensions consists of those morphisms ϕ *that recursively satisfy*

$$H^{p(S)-1}(\kappa_S(\phi|_{U_S})) = 0 \text{ in } \mathrm{Mor}_{\pi_1(S)}(H^{p(S)-1}(\kappa_S\mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E})), H^{p(S)}(\kappa_S\mathcal{P}_{T'}(\mathbf{E}'))) \ .$$

for all S *satisfying* $S \prec T$ *and* $S \prec T'$. *Here* V_S *is an open union of strata containing* S *as a minimal stratum and* $U_S = V_S \setminus S$; *the condition above allows one to uniquely extend* ϕ *from* U_S *to* V_S.

Remarks. (i) The condition (4.1) needed to prolong an extension can be nontrivial even in the case $T = T'$; one example of an extension of coefficient systems failing this condition (and hence not prolonging to an extension of perverse sheaves) is [14, Examples 2.2.5 and 2.7.1]. The point is that the intermediate extension function $\mathbf{E} \mapsto \mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E})$ (3.4) is not exact even though it preserves injective and surjective maps [14, §2.7].

(ii) In §5.2 we will define a more refined notion of constructibility in which local systems on a stratum T are associated to algebraic representations of a reductive group L_T. All the results of this section hold in this context except one should replace $\mathrm{Mor}_{\pi_1(T)}$ by Mor_{L_T} as needed. In addition, since algebraic representations of a reductive group are semisimple, there are no extensions between simple objects when $T = T'$.

5. Reductive Borel-Serre compactification

The reductive Borel-Serre compactification $\widehat{X}$ first appeared in work of Zucker [45] and has grown in importance far beyond its original use. We recall it following [18], focusing mainly on its structure rather than its construction.

5.1. **Stratification.** For G a reductive algebraic group defined over $\mathbf{Q}$ and Γ an arithmetic subgroup, let $X = X_G = \Gamma\backslash G(\mathbf{R})/A_G(\mathbf{R})K$ be the corresponding locally symmetric space. Here A_G is the maximal $\mathbf{Q}$-split torus in the center of G, and K is a maximal compact subgroup of $G(\mathbf{R})$.

For a parabolic $\mathbf{Q}$-subgroup S of G, let $L_S = S/N_S$ denote its reductive Levi quotient, where N_S denotes the unipotent radical of S; it is also defined over $\mathbf{Q}$. We have an almost direct product $L_S = M_S A_S$ where $M_S = {}^0L_S = \bigcap_\chi \ker \chi^2$, where χ runs over characters of L_S defined over $\mathbf{Q}$. Let $\Gamma_{N_S} = \Gamma \cap N_S$ and $\Gamma_{L_S} = (\Gamma \cap S)/(\Gamma \cap N_S)$ be the induced arithmetic subgroups. Starting from L_S and Γ_{L_S} we again obtain a locally symmetric space X_S. If S' is Γ-conjugate to S, then $X_{S'}$ and X_S may be canonically identified.

The reductive Borel-Serre compactification of X is the stratified pseudomanifold $\widehat{X} = \coprod_S X_S$ (where S ranges over the Γ-conjugacy classes of parabolic $\mathbf{Q}$-subgroups of G) endowed with an appropriate topology. The closure of a stratum X_S is denoted $\widehat{X}_S$; it is indeed the reductive Borel-Serre compactification of X_S and its strata X_T correspond to Γ-conjugacy classes of parabolic $\mathbf{Q}$-subgroups having a representative $T \subseteq S$.

From now on we we will abuse notation by using the same letter S to denote a stratum X_S, the corresponding Γ-conjugacy class of parabolic $\mathbf{Q}$-subgroups, and a representative of that class. Thus the partial order $S \preccurlyeq T$ on strata corresponds on parabolic subgroups to $S \subseteq {}^\gamma T$ for some $\gamma \in \Gamma$.

The *depth* of a stratum S of $\widehat{X}$, $\operatorname{depth} S$, is the maximal length d of a chain $S = S_0 \prec S_1 \prec \cdots \prec S_d = X$. If $S \preccurlyeq T$, the *relative depth* of S viewed as a stratum of $\overline{T}$, $\operatorname{depth}_T S$, is the maximal length of a chain $S = S_0 \prec S_1 \prec \cdots \prec S_d = T$. We have $\operatorname{depth}_T S = \dim A_S - \dim A_T$.

An algebraic representation E of L_S induces a representation of Γ_{L_S} and hence a local system $\mathbf{E}$ on S.

5.2. **Reductive constructibility.** A constructible complex of sheaves $\mathcal{S}$ on a pseudomanifold has the property that for all strata S, the cohomology sheaves of $i_S^*\mathcal{S}$, $i_S^!\mathcal{S}$, and $\kappa_S\mathcal{S}$ are all finitely generated locally constant and hence are associated to finite-dimensional representations of Γ_{L_S}. Furthermore the maps on cohomology induced by the distinguished triangle $i_S^!\mathcal{S} \to i_S^*\mathcal{S} \to \kappa_S\mathcal{S} \xrightarrow{[1]}$ are morphisms of Γ_{L_S}-representations. A *reductively constructible* complex of sheaves $\mathcal{S}$ on $\widehat{X}$ is as above but has been enriched with extra structure so that all of these locally constant sheaves arise from algebraic representations of L_S and that the morphisms above are morphisms of L_S-modules. Morphisms between such sheaves must also induce morphisms of L_S-modules on the cohomology sheaves over a stratum.

Rather than construct the derived category of reductively constructible sheaves $\mathbf{D}^b_{rc}(\widehat{X})$ directly as suggested above, we note instead that if one starts with the category of $\mathcal{L}$-modules constructed in [40] and pass to the homotopy category, one obtains the desired category of reductively constructible sheaves. (In the homotopy category of $\mathcal{L}$-modules, every quasi-isomorphism is already an isomorphism and thus one does not need to localize further.) We will discuss the details elsewhere.

Exactly as in §3 one can define a perverse t-structure on $\mathbf{D}^b_{rc}(\widehat{X})$ and obtain a category of perverse sheaves which we again denote $\mathbf{P}(\widehat{X})$. The description of simple objects is the same except we start with $\mathbf{E}$ on T coming from an algebraic representation of L_T. The fact that the pushforward functors in the definition of the simple perverse sheaves do preserve reductive constructibility is a consequence of the theorems of Nomizu, van Est, and Kostant

which we recall in §6. The results in §4 all remain true with identical proofs however one must replace $\pi_1(S)$-morphisms with L_S-morphisms in Lemmas 4.3 and 4.4.

Enriching our objects $\mathcal{S}$ so that $H(i_S^*\mathcal{S})$ has an action of the central split torus $A_S \subset L_S$ is new data. However aside from this, passing from the constructible category to the reductively constructible category is not as major a change as it may appear at first glance due to the Borel density theorem [8] and Margulis superrigidity [30].

5.3. **Links.** We recall the link of a stratum S of $\widehat{X}$ following [18] (see also [41, §7]).

For any parabolic $\mathbf{Q}$-subgroup S, the Levi quotient L_S acts (via a lift to S) by conjugation on the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{n}_S$ of N_S. Though this action depends on the lift, the weights by which A_S acts on $\mathfrak{n}_S$ are well-defined and have a unique basis denoted Δ_S. If $S \subseteq S'$, then $N_{S'} \lhd N_S$ and group $A_{S'}$ may be naturally viewed as a subgroup of A_S. We let $\Delta_S^{S'} \subseteq \Delta_{S'}$ be those weights that restrict trivially to $A_{S'}$. The correspondence $S' \mapsto \Delta_S^{S'}$ is an order preserving bijection between parabolic $\mathbf{Q}$-subgroups containing S and subsets of Δ_S. Restriction to $A_{S'}$ yields a bijection between $\Delta_S \setminus \Delta_S^{S'}$ and $\Delta_{S'}$. Note that $\Delta_S^G = \Delta_S$.

Let $|\Delta_S|$ be a topological simplex with vertices indexed by the elements of Δ_S. Give $|\Delta_S|$ the stratification by its open faces $|\Delta_S^{S'}|^\circ = \operatorname{int}|\Delta_S^{S'}|$ indexed by $S' \supsetneq S$. Note that

$$\dim|\Delta_S| = \operatorname{depth} S \ .$$

The topological link of the stratum $S \subset \widehat{X}$ is

$$\operatorname{Lk}_S = (\,\Gamma_{N_S}\backslash N_S(\mathbf{R}) \times |\Delta_S|\,)/\sim \tag{5.1}$$

where if $t \in |\Delta_S^{S'}|^\circ$, $(n,t) \sim (n'n,t)$ for all $n' \in N_{S'}(\mathbf{R})$. Thus the intersection of the link of S with higher strata $S' \supset S$ is

$$\operatorname{Lk}_S \cap S' = \Gamma_{N_S^{S'}}\backslash N_S^{S'}(\mathbf{R}) \times |\Delta_S^{S'}|^\circ \ , \tag{5.2}$$

where $N_S^{S'} = N_S/N_{S'}$ and $\Gamma_{N_S^{S'}} = \Gamma_{N_S}/\Gamma_{N_{S'}}$.

More generally, the topological link of S viewed as a stratum of $\overline{T}$ (for $S \preccurlyeq T$) is

$$\operatorname{Lk}_S^T = \Big(\,\Gamma_{N_S^T}\backslash N_S^T(\mathbf{R}) \times |\Delta_S^T|\,\Big)\Big/\sim \tag{5.3}$$

and

$$\dim|\Delta_S^T| = \operatorname{depth}_T S \ .$$

If $S \preccurlyeq S' \preccurlyeq T$, we have again

$$\operatorname{Lk}_S^T \cap S' = \operatorname{Lk}_S \cap S' \Gamma_{N_S^{S'}}\backslash N_S^{S'}(\mathbf{R}) \times |\Delta_S^{S'}|^\circ \ . \tag{5.4}$$

6. Link cohomology in $\widehat{X}$

To actually calculate extensions we need to understand the link cohomology functor $\kappa_S = i_S^* j_{S*}$ on a stratum S. We calculate the link cohomology of $\mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E})$ for strata S of relative depth 1, 2, and 3, following the formula given in [40, §5.5] (see also [41, §18.4]).

6.1. **Kostant's theorem.** The calculation of $H(\kappa_S \mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E}))$ given later will involve the Lie algebra cohomology $H(\mathfrak{n}_S^T, E)$ where $\mathfrak{n}_S^T$ is the Lie algebra of N_S^T. The adjoint action of L_S on $\mathfrak{n}_S^T$ (via choice of a lift) induces an defined action of L_S on $H(\mathfrak{n}_S^T, E)$ which is independent of the lift. We begin by recalling Kostant's theorem [27] which gives a decomposition of $H(\mathfrak{n}_S^T, E)$ as an L_S-module.

We first consider $T = G$ and let E be an irreducible algebraic representation of G. Choose a Cartan subalgebra for the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{l}_S$ of L_S; it lifts to a Cartan subalgebra of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ of G. Choose an order on the roots of $\mathfrak{g}$ so that the roots in $\mathfrak{n}_S$ are all positive. Let ρ be one-half the sum of the positive roots of $\mathfrak{g}$. Let $W = W^G$ be the Weyl group of the root system of $\mathfrak{g}$ with corresponding length function $\ell(w)$. Let $W^S \subseteq W$ be the subgroup generated by the simple reflections in roots of $\mathfrak{l}_S$. Let $W_S \subseteq W$ be the set of unique minimal length representatives of cosets in $W^S \backslash W$. Thus there is a product decomposition $W = W^S W_S$. For E an irreducible algebraic representation of G with highest weight λ, Kostant's theorem says

$$H(\mathfrak{n}_S, E) = \bigoplus_{w \in W_s} H^{\ell(w)}(\mathfrak{n}_S, E)_w[-\ell(w)]$$

where $H^{\ell(w)}(\mathfrak{n}_S, E)_w$ is an irreducible L_S-module and has highest weight $w(\lambda + \rho) - \rho$.

Consider now $H(\mathfrak{n}_S^T, E)$ where $S \prec T$ and E is an irreducible algebraic representation of L_T with highest weight λ. We replace G above by L_T. Thus let ρ^T be one-half the sum of the positive roots of $\mathfrak{l}_T$, let W^T be the Weyl group of the root system of $\mathfrak{l}_T$. We have a decomposition $W^T = W^S W_S^T$, where W_S^T consists of the minimal length representatives of the cosets in $W^S \backslash W^T$. Kostant's theorem here says

$$H(\mathfrak{n}_S^T, E) = \bigoplus_{w \in W_s^T} H^{\ell(w)}(\mathfrak{n}_S^T, E)_w[-\ell(w)]$$

where $H^{\ell(w)}(\mathfrak{n}_S^T, E)_w$ has highest weight $w(\lambda + \rho^T) - \rho^T$.

6.2. **Relative depth 1.** Let $\mathbf{E}$ be a local system on T corresponding to an algebraic representation E of L_T. By (5.4), since $\operatorname{depth}_T S = 1$, the link Lk_S^T is simply the compact nilmanifold $\Gamma_{N_S^T} \backslash N_S^T(\mathbf{R})$. Thus

$$H(\kappa_S \mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E})) = H(\Gamma_{N_S^T} \backslash N_S^T(\mathbf{R}); \mathbf{E})[-p(T)] \cong H(\mathfrak{n}_S^T, E)[-p(T)] \ . \tag{6.1}$$

Here we use the theorem of Nomizu and van Est [35, 44] for the last isomorphism with Lie algebra cohomology. In fact the action of L_S on $\mathfrak{n}_S^T$ induces an action on $H(\mathfrak{n}_S^T, E)$ and the isomorphism in (6.1) is an isomorphism of L_S-modules.

If we combine this with Kostant's theorem we obtain

$$H(\kappa_S \mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E})) \cong \bigoplus_{w \in W_S^T} H^{\ell(w)}(\mathfrak{n}_S^T, E)_w[-\ell(w) - p(T)] \ . \tag{6.2}$$

Note that to go from here to $H(i_S^* \mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E}))$, according to (3.5) and (3.7), we need to truncate this cohomology, leaving just degrees $< p(S)$. Thus the sum will now only include w satisfying $\ell(w) + p(T) \leq p(S) - 1$, or

$$\ell(w) \leq p(S) - p(T) - 1 = \bar{p}_T(S) \ .$$

Thus for relative depth 1

$$H(i_S^*\mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E})) \cong \bigoplus_{\substack{w\in W_S^T\\ \ell(w)\le \bar p_T(S)}} H^{\ell(w)}(\mathfrak{n}_S^T, E)_w[-\ell(w)-p(T)] \tag{6.3}$$

(compare §3.3).

6.3. **Relative depth 2.** If $\operatorname{depth}_T S = 2$, the simplex $|\Delta_S^T|$ is a 1-simplex. The endpoints correspond to the two intermediate strata: $S \prec Q_1, Q_2 \prec T$. The cohomology of the interior of the link is the same as (6.2), however each term may be truncated at Q_1 or at Q_2 or at both — see (3.5) as well as (6.3). The terms that remain are those that are not truncated at either side or (with an additional shift by -1) those that are truncated at both sides. This corresponds to the fact that the cohomology of a 1-simplex relative to either one of its endpoints vanishes, while the cohomology relative to both endpoints is one dimensional in degree 1.

To precisely express these side truncations, write $W^T = W^{Q_1}W_{Q_1}^T = W^S W_S^{Q_i} W_{Q_i}^T$. In fact $W_S^T = W_S^{Q_i}W_{Q_1}^T$ and for $w \in W_S^T$ we decompose $w = w^{Q_i}w_{Q_i}$ accordingly. Define

$$\ell_{Q_i}(w) = \ell(w_{Q_i}) \qquad (w = w^{Q_i}w_{Q_i})\ .$$

Then we have the formula

$$\begin{aligned} H(\kappa_S\mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E})) \cong &\bigoplus_{\substack{w\in W_S^T\\ \ell_{Q_1}(w)\le\bar p_T(Q_1)\\ \ell_{Q_2}(w)\le\bar p_T(Q_2)}} H^{\ell(w)}(\mathfrak{n}_S^T, E)_w[-\ell(w)-p(T)] \\ &\oplus \bigoplus_{\substack{w\in W_S^T\\ \ell_{Q_1}(w)>\bar p_T(Q_1)\\ \ell_{Q_2}(w)>\bar p_T(Q_2)}} H^{\ell(w)}(\mathfrak{n}_S^T, E)_w[-\ell(w)-p(T)-1] \end{aligned} \tag{6.4}$$

6.4. **Relative depth 3 and higher.** One can similarly write an explicit formula for $H(\kappa_S\mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E}))$ when $\operatorname{depth}_T S = 3$ however there are many more possible configurations of truncations on the 6 intermediate strata Q; these are illustrated in [41, §18.4, Figure 24] and result in additional degree shifts of 0, -1, and -2.

There is a general formula for arbitrary depth that involves the intersection cohomology of $|\Delta_S^T|$ associated to a special perversity:

$$\bar p_{T,w}(Q) = \bar p_T(Q) - \ell_Q(w) = p(Q) - p(T) - 1 - \ell_Q(w) \qquad (S \preccurlyeq Q \preccurlyeq T)\ .$$

Let

$$I_{\bar p_{T,w}}H^\cdot(|\Delta_S^T|) = H^\cdot(\mathcal{I}_{\bar p_{T,w}}\mathcal{C}(|\Delta_S^T|, \mathbf{Z}))$$

be the hypercohomology of the corresponding Deligne sheaf (3.10). Then

$$H(\kappa_S\mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E})) \cong \bigoplus_{w\in W_S^T} H^{\ell(w)}(\mathfrak{n}_S^T, E)_w[-\ell(w)-p(T)] \otimes I_{\bar p_{T,w}}H(|\Delta_S^T|)\ . \tag{6.5}$$

7. Example Computations

To illustrate the results of §4, we calculate all extensions between simple perverse sheaves for the reductive Borel-Serre compactification $\widehat{X}$ of the locally symmetric spaces associated with $G = \mathrm{Sp}(4, \mathbf{R})$. Since $\mathrm{Ext}^1_{\mathbf{P}}(\mathcal{P}_T(\mathbf{E}), \mathcal{P}_{T'}(\mathbf{E}')) = 0$ unless $T \prec T'$ or $T \succ T'$, we can assume both T and T' are standard parabolic $\mathbf{Q}$-subgroups.

For brevity we only consider $p = p_-$ and we give complete details for $T \succ T'$; the results for $T \prec T'$ are summarized in §7.4.

7.1. **Preliminaries.** Here the root system is type C_2 with simple $\mathbf{Q}$-roots $\Delta = \{\alpha_1 = e_1 - e_2, \alpha_2 = 2e_2\}$. The standard parabolic $\mathbf{Q}$-subgroups P_I correspond to subsets $I \subseteq \{1, 2\}$ ($\Delta^{P_I} = \{\alpha_i\}_{i \in I} \subseteq \Delta$) and so form a lattice



The real dimension of X is 6, while strata corresponding to P_1 and P_2 have dimension 2, and that corresponding to $P_\emptyset$ has dimension 0. Thus the perversity values $p_-(S)$ are



To calculate link cohomology we need the Weyl group which is generated by the reflections s_1 and s_2 in the simple roots modulo the relation $(s_1 s_2)^3 = e$:

$$W = W_{P_\emptyset} = \{e, s_1, s_2, s_1 s_2, s_2 s_1, s_1 s_2 s_1, s_2 s_1 s_2\} \ .$$

For the intermediate strata we have

$$W^{P_1} = W^{P_1}_{P_\emptyset} = \{e, s_1\} \qquad \text{and} \qquad W^{P_2} = W^{P_2}_{P_\emptyset} = \{e, s_2\}$$

and

$$W_{P_1} = \{e, s_2, s_2 s_1, s_2 s_1 s_2\} \qquad \text{and} \qquad W_{P_2} = \{e, s_1, s_1 s_2, s_1 s_2 s_1\} \ .$$

7.2. **The case $T = G$.** We first set $T = G$ and E an irreducible algebraic representation of G with highest weight λ. The associated classical perversity $\bar{p}_G(S) = p(S) - p(G) - 1$ has values



We look for nonzero extensions in $\mathrm{Ext}^1_{\mathbf{P}_-}(\mathcal{P}_G(\mathbf{E}), \mathcal{P}_{T'}(\mathbf{E}'))$ for $T' \prec G$, where E' is an irreducible algebraic representation of $L_{T'}$. To start constructing such an extension, according to Lemma 4.3(iii), we need an $L_{T'}$-module morphism

$$H^{p(T')-1}(\kappa_{T'} \mathcal{P}_G(\mathbf{E})) \longrightarrow E' \ .$$

We calculate the above link cohomology. We begin with $T' = P_\emptyset$ for which we use (6.4). In degree $p(T')-1$, a contribution from the first direct sum of (6.4) requires $\ell(w) = \bar{p}_G(P_\emptyset) = 2$ and no truncation on either side. This means $w = s_1s_2$ or s_2s_1. Now $\ell_{P_1}(s_1s_2) = 1 \leq 1 = \bar{p}_G(P_1)$ (since $s_1s_2 = (s_1)(s_2) \in W^{P_1}W_{P_1}$) and $\ell_{P_2}(s_1s_2) = 2 \not\leq 1 = \bar{p}_G(P_2)$ (since $s_1s_2 = (e)(s_1s_2) \in W^{P_1}W_{P_1}$). Thus s_1s_2 cannot contribute to the link cohomology since the corresponding class is truncated on one side but not the other. Similarly s_2s_1 does not contribute since $\ell_{P_1}(s_2s_1) = 2 \not\leq 1$ and $\ell_{P_2}(s_2s_1) = 1 \leq 1$.

A contribution in degree $p(T') - 1$ from the second direct sum of (6.4) requires $\ell(w) = \bar{p}_G(P_\emptyset) - 1 = 1$ and truncation on both sides. Thus $w = s_1$ or w_2. For $w = s_1$, $\ell_{P_1}(s_1) = 0 \not> \bar{p}_G(P_1) = 1$ and $\ell_{P_2}(s_1) = 1 \not> \bar{p}_G(P_2) = 1$ and thus does not contribute, and similarly for $w = s_2$.

Thus $H^{p(P_\emptyset)-1}(\kappa_{P_\emptyset}\mathcal{P}_G(\mathbf{E})) = 0$ and

$$\operatorname{Ext}^1_{\mathbf{P}_-}(\mathcal{P}_G(\mathbf{E}), \mathcal{P}_{P_\emptyset}(\mathbf{E}')) = 0$$

for all E'.

We now consider the link cohomology at $T' = P_1$ or P_2. Since we are interested in degree $p(T') - 1$, a contribution from (6.2) requires $\ell(w) = \bar{p}_G(T') = 1$. Thus

$$H^{p(T')-1}(\kappa_{T'}\mathcal{P}_G(\mathbf{E})) = \begin{cases} H^1(\mathfrak{n}_{P_1}, E)_{s_2} & T' = P_1, \\ H^1(\mathfrak{n}_{P_2}, E)_{s_1} & T' = P_2. \end{cases} \tag{7.1}$$

This means that $\operatorname{Ext}^1_{\mathbf{P}_-}(\mathcal{P}_G(\mathbf{E}), \mathcal{P}_{P_1}(\mathbf{E}'))$ can only be nonzero (in which case it is $\mathbf{C}$) when E' has highest weight $s_2(\lambda+\rho)-\rho$. By Lemma 4.4, this extension will actually exist provided the map of L_{P_1}-modules

$$\phi\colon H^{-2}(\kappa_{P_1}\mathcal{P}_G(\mathbf{E})) = H^1(\mathfrak{n}_{P_1}, E)_{s_2} \longrightarrow E'$$

(which is an isomorphism), induces the zero map

$$H^{p(P_\emptyset)-1}(\kappa_{P_\emptyset}\mathcal{P}_G(\mathbf{E})) \longrightarrow H^{p(P_\emptyset)}(\kappa_{P_\emptyset}\mathcal{P}_{P_1}(\mathbf{E}')). \tag{7.2}$$

However we have already seen that $H^{p(P_\emptyset)-1}(\kappa_{P_\emptyset}\mathcal{P}_G(\mathbf{E})) = 0$, thus this condition is satisfied.

So we find that

$$\operatorname{Ext}^1_{\mathbf{P}_-}(\mathcal{P}_G(\mathbf{E}), \mathcal{P}_{P_1}(\mathbf{E}')) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{C} & \text{if } E' \text{ has highest weight } s_2(\lambda+\rho)-\rho, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{7.3}$$

A similar argument shows

$$\operatorname{Ext}^1_{\mathbf{P}_-}(\mathcal{P}_G(\mathbf{E}), \mathcal{P}_{P_2}(\mathbf{E}')) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{C} & \text{if } E' \text{ has highest weight } s_1(\lambda+\rho)-\rho, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{7.4}$$

7.3. **The case $T = P_1$ and P_2.** Fix $i = 1$ or 2, and say E is an irreducible algebraic representation of L_{P_i} with highest weight λ. By Lemma 4.3(iii)

$$\operatorname{Ext}^1_{\mathbf{P}_-}(\mathcal{P}_{P_i}(\mathbf{E}), \mathcal{P}_{P_\emptyset}(\mathbf{E}')) \cong \operatorname{Mor}_{L_{P_\emptyset}}(H^{p(P_\emptyset)-1}(\kappa_{P_\emptyset}\mathcal{P}_{P_i}(\mathbf{E})), E')$$

for any irreducible algebraic representation E' of $L_{P_\emptyset}$. Since $L_{P_\emptyset}$ is just the maximal torus, $E' = \mathbf{C}_\chi$ where χ is the character by which $L_{P_\emptyset}$ acts. We calculate by (6.2) that

$$H^{p(P_\emptyset)-1}(\kappa_{P_\emptyset}\mathcal{P}_{P_i}(\mathbf{E})) = \bigoplus_{\substack{w \in W_{P_\emptyset}^{P_i} \\ \ell(w) = \bar{p}_{P_i}(P_\emptyset)}} H^{\ell(w)}(\mathfrak{n}_{P_\emptyset}^{P_i}, E) = H^0(\mathfrak{n}_{P_\emptyset}^{P_i}, E)_e$$

since $\bar{p}_{P_i}(P_\emptyset) = 0$. Thus we find

$$\operatorname{Ext}^1_{\mathbf{P}_-}(\mathcal{P}_{P_i}(\mathbf{E}), \mathcal{P}_{P_\emptyset}(\mathbf{E}')) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{C} & \text{if } E' = \mathbf{C}_\lambda, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{7.5}$$

7.4. **Results for $T \prec T'$.** Let E' be an irreducible algebraic representation of $L_{T'}$ with highest weight λ. Similarly to the above, one may check that for $T \prec T'$, the only nonzero extensions are as follows:

$$\operatorname{Ext}^1_{\mathbf{P}_-}(\mathcal{P}_{P_\emptyset}(\mathbf{E}), \mathcal{P}_{P_1}(\mathbf{E}')) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{C} & \text{if } E = \mathbf{C}_{s_1(\lambda+\rho)-\rho}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{7.6}$$

$$\operatorname{Ext}^1_{\mathbf{P}_-}(\mathcal{P}_{P_\emptyset}(\mathbf{E}), \mathcal{P}_{P_2}(\mathbf{E}')) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{C} & \text{if } E = \mathbf{C}_{s_2(\lambda+\rho)-\rho}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{7.7}$$

$$\operatorname{Ext}^1_{\mathbf{P}_-}(\mathcal{P}_{P_1}(\mathbf{E}), \mathcal{P}_G(\mathbf{E}')) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{C} & \text{if } E \text{ has highest weight } s_2 s_1(\lambda+\rho)-\rho, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{7.8}$$

$$\operatorname{Ext}^1_{\mathbf{P}_-}(\mathcal{P}_{P_2}(\mathbf{E}), \mathcal{P}_G(\mathbf{E}')) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{C} & \text{if } E \text{ has highest weight } s_1 s_2(\lambda+\rho)-\rho, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{7.9}$$

References

[1] A. Ash, D. Mumford, M. Rapoport, and Y. Tai, *Smooth compactification of locally symmetric varieties*, Math Sci Press, Brookline, 1975.

[2] J. Ayoub and S. Zucker, *Relative Artin motives and the reductive Borel-Serre compactification of a locally symmetric variety*, Invent. Math. **188** (2012), no. 2, 277–427.

[3] W. Baily and A. Borel, *Compactification of arithmetic quotients of bounded symmetric domains*, Ann. of Math. **84** (1966), 442–528.

[4] A. Beĭlinson, *On the derived category of perverse sheaves*, k-theory, arithmetic and geometry (moscow, 1984–1986), 1987, pp. 27–41.

[5] A. Beilinson, J. Bernstein, and P. Deligne, *Faisceaux pervers*, Analyse et topologie sur les espaces singuliers (I), CIRM, 6–10 juillet 1981, 1982.

[6] A. Beilinson and J. Bernstein, *Localisation de g-modules*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. **292** (1981), no. 1, 15–18.

[7] G. Böckle and C. Khare, *Mod l representations of arithmetic fundamental groups. II. A conjecture of A. J. de Jong*, Compos. Math. **142** (2006), no. 2, 271–294.

[8] A. Borel, *Density properties for certain subgroups of semi-simple groups without compact components*, Ann. of Math. **72** (1960), 179–188.

[9] A. Borel et al., *Intersection cohomology*, Birkhäuser, Boston, 1984.

[10] A. Borel and H. Garland, *Laplacian and the discrete spectrum of an arithmetic group*, Amer. J. Math. **105** (1983), no. 2, 309–335.

[11] J.-L. Brylinski and M. Kashiwara, *Kazhdan-Lusztig conjecture and holonomic systems*, Invent. Math. **64** (1981), no. 3, 387–410.

[12] D. C. Cohen, M. Goresky, and L. Ji, *On the Künneth formula for intersection cohomology*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **333** (1992), no. 1, 63–69.
[13] M. A. A. de Cataldo and L. Migliorini, *The Hodge theory of algebraic maps*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) **38** (2005), no. 5, 693–750.
[14] ———, *The decomposition theorem, perverse sheaves and the topology of algebraic maps*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.) **46** (2009), no. 4, 535–633.
[15] A. J. de Jong, *A conjecture on arithmetic fundamental groups*, Israel J. Math. **121** (2001), 61–84.
[16] V. Drinfeld, *On a conjecture of Kashiwara*, Math. Res. Lett. **8** (2001), no. 5-6, 713–728.
[17] D. Gaitsgory, *On de jong's conjecture*, 2004. `arXiv:math/0402184v4 [math.AG]`.
[18] M. Goresky, G. Harder, and R. MacPherson, *Weighted cohomology*, Invent. Math. **116** (1994), 139–213.
[19] M. Goresky and R. MacPherson, *Intersection homology theory*, Topology **19** (1980), no. 2, 135–162.
[20] ———, *Intersection homology II*, Invent. Math. **72** (1983), 77–129.
[21] ———, *Weighted cohomology of Satake compactifications*, 1988. Centre de recherches mathématiques, preprint #1593.
[22] M. Goresky and Y.-S. Tai, *Toroidal and reductive borel-serre compactifications of locally symmetric spaces*, Amer. J. Math. **121** (1999), 1095–1151.
[23] M. Kashiwara, *Semisimple holonomic $\mathcal{D}$-modules*, Topological field theory, primitive forms and related topics (Kyoto, 1996), 1998, pp. 267–271.
[24] D. Kazhdan and G. Lusztig, *Representations of Coxeter groups and Hecke algebras*, Invent. Math. **53** (1979), no. 2, 165–184.
[25] ———, *Schubert varieties and Poincaré duality*, Geometry of the Laplace operator (Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., Univ. Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii, 1979), 1980, pp. 185–203.
[26] S. L. Kleiman, *The development of intersection homology theory*, Pure Appl. Math. Q. **3** (2007), no. 1, Special Issue: In honor of Robert D. MacPherson. Part 3, 225–282.
[27] B. Kostant, *Lie algebra cohomology and the generalized Borel-Weil theorem*, Ann. of Math. **74** (1961), 329–387.
[28] J.-S. Li and J. Schwermer, *On the Eisenstein cohomology of arithmetic groups*, Duke Math. J. **123** (2004), no. 1, 141–169.
[29] E. Looijenga, *L^2-cohomology of locally symmetric varieties*, Compositio Math. **67** (1988), 3–20.
[30] G. A. Margulis, *Discrete subgroups of semisimple lie groups*, Springer, Berlin, 1991.
[31] Y. Matsushima and S. Murakami, *On vector bundle valued harmonic forms and automorphic forms on symmetric Riemannian manifolds*, Ann. of Math. **78** (1963), 365–416.
[32] T. Mochizuki, *Asymptotic behaviour of tame harmonic bundles and an application to pure twistor D-modules. I*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **185** (2007), no. 869, xii+324.
[33] ———, *Asymptotic behaviour of tame harmonic bundles and an application to pure twistor D-modules. II*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **185** (2007), no. 870, xii+565.
[34] ———, *Wild harmonic bundles and wild pure twistor D-modules*, Astérisque **340** (2011), x+607.
[35] K. Nomizu, *On the cohomology of compact homogeneous spaces of nilpotent Lie groups*, Ann. of Math. **59** (1954), 531–538.
[36] M. Rapoport, *On the shape of the contribution of a fixed point on the boundary*: *The case of* $\mathbf{Q}$*-rank 1* (*with an appendix by L. Saper and M. Stern*), The zeta functions of Picard modular surfaces, 1992, pp. 479–488.
[37] C. Sabbah, *Polarizable twistor $\mathcal{D}$-modules*, Astérisque **300** (2005), vi+208.
[38] M. Saito, *Modules de Hodge polarisables*, Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. **24** (1988), no. 6, 849–995 (1989).
[39] ———, *Mixed Hodge modules*, Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. **26** (1990), no. 2, 221–333.
[40] L. Saper, *$\mathcal{L}$-modules and micro-support*, 2001. to appear, `arXiv:math.RT/0112251`.
[41] ———, *On the cohomology of locally symmetric spaces and of their compactifications*, Current developments in mathematics, 2002, 2003, pp. 219–289.
[42] ———, *$\mathcal{L}$-modules and the conjecture of Rapoport and Goresky-MacPherson*, Formes automorphes, I — actes du semestre du Centre émile Borel, printemps 2000, 2005, pp. 319–334.
[43] L. Saper and M. Stern, *L_2-cohomology of arithmetic varieties*, Ann. of Math. **132** (1990), 1–69.
[44] W. T. van Est, *A generalization of the Cartan-Leray sequence, I, II*, Indag. Math. **20** (1958), 399–413.
[45] S. Zucker, *L_2 cohomology of warped products and arithmetic groups*, Invent. Math. **70** (1982), 169–218.
[46] ———, *Satake compactifications*, Comment. Math. Helv. **58** (1983), 312–343.

[47] S. Zucker, *Locally homogeneous variations of Hodge structure*, Enseign. Math. (2) **27** (1981), no. 3-4, 243–276.

[48] ———, *On the reductive Borel-Serre compactification. III. Mixed Hodge structures*, Asian J. Math. **8** (2004), no. 4, 881–911.

Department of Mathematics, Duke University, Durham, NC 27708
E-mail address: saper@math.duke.edu